1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
9		
10	MICHAEL Y. PETERSON,	
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 13-cv-05943 JRC
12	v.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT
13 14	CAROLYN W COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration,	TO 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)
15	Defendant.	
16 17	This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and Local	
	Magistrate Judge Rule MJR 13 (see also Notice of Initial Assignment to a U.S. Magistrate Judge	
18	and Consent Form, Dkt. 5; Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge, Dkt. 6).	
19 20	This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §	
20	406(b) (see Dkt. 26). Defendant has no objection to plaintiff's request (see Dkt. 27).	
22	The Court may allow a reasonable fee for an attorney who represented a Social Security	
23	Title II claimant before the Court and obtained a favorable judgment, as long as such fee is not in	
24	excess of 25 percent of the total of past-due benefits. See 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1); Grisbrecht v.	

Barnhart, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). When a contingency agreement applies, the Court will look first 2 to such agreement and will conduct an independent review to assure the reasonableness of the fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation and results achieved. 3 See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 807, 808 (footnote omitted) (citations omitted). Although the 5 fee agreement is the primary means for determining the fee, the Court will adjust the fee 6 downward if substandard representation was provided, if the attorney caused excessive delay, or 7 if a windfall would result from the requested fee. See Crawford v. Astrue, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151 8 (9th Cir. 2009) (*citing Grisbrecht*, *supra*, 535 U.S. at 808). 9 Here, the representation was standard, at least, and the results achieved excellent (see 10 Dkt. 26, Attachment 3). See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 808. There has not been excessive 11 delay and no windfall will result from the requested fee. 12 Plaintiff's total back payment was \$28,462.35 (see Dkt. 26, Attachment 3, p. 2). Plaintiff has moved for a net attorney's fee of \$1,115.59 (see Motion, Dkt. 26, p. 1), and the Court has 13 14 considered plaintiff's gross attorney's fee of \$7,115.59; the EAJA award received by plaintiff's 15 attorney in the amount of \$5,362.22 (plus expenses of \$24.08); and the \$1,740.00 offset to that 16 EAJA award that was garnished pursuant to the Department of the Treasury's Offset program; 17 and plaintiff's request for an additional reduction of \$2,353.70 (see id.; see also Attachments 3, 4, 6, 7). See 31 U.S.C. §§ 3711(a), 3716(a); Astrue v. Ratliff, 560 U.S.C. 586, 589, 593, 130 S.Ct. 18 19 2521, 2524, 2527 (2010); Parish v. Comm'r. Soc. Sec. Admin., 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 20 2012). 21 Based on plaintiff's motion and supporting documents (see Dkt. 26, Attachments 1, 2, 3, 22 4, 5, 6, 7), and with no objection from defendant (Dkt. 27), it is hereby ORDERED that 23 24

attorney's fees in the amount of \$1,115.59 be awarded to plaintiff's attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b). When issuing the 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) check for payment to plaintiff's attorney herein, the Social Security Administration is directed to send to plaintiff's attorney the net balance of \$1,115.59, minus any applicable processing fees as allowed by statute. Dated this 8th day of July, 2016. J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge